

0229

101-6



THREE
LETTERS
TO
THE EDITOR
OF
The Maidstone Gazette,
RELATIVE TO A
FREE TRADE IN CORN,
IN GREAT BRITAIN,
WITH SOME PREFATORY REMARKS.

ALSO

An Appendix,
UPON THE STATE OF
WOOL AND WOOLLEN TRADES,

BY
WM. KEER BROWN.

Second Edition.

LONDON:

HARDING, ST. JAMES'S STREET; RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY;
LODER, WOODBRIDGE; RAW, DECK, IPSWICH; DECK, BURY;
BACON AND KINNEBROOKE, MATCHETT AND
STEVENSON, NORWICH; AND ALL
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1826.

PREFACE.



A GREAT PHILOSOPHER, Lord Bacon, has declared that—“*knowledge is power* ;” and it has been demonstrated by the successful exertions of public communities, where it has existed, that—“*union is strength*” —a position that cannot, at this moment, be too much inculcated upon the attention of the Agricultural body at large. The promotion, among other objects, of *this necessary union both of principle and action*, has been my humble endeavour in the following pages, as in a letter I had the honour not long since to address to a distinguished Member of His Majesty's Government.*—In publishing these letters, I assume no higher merit than that of, I trust, having plainly stated some facts

* Letter to the Right Hon. George Canning, M. P. &c. &c. &c, relative to a Free Trade in Corn in Great Britain, 1st November, 1825.

(whether of importance in the great question must be left to the judgment of others) and of equally drawing some plain inferences from them; for it would be great presumption to suppose myself capable, in any great degree, of lucidly reasoning upon all the combination of causes and effects that may arise out of an alteration of the present British Corn Laws.—This must be left to those whose attainments and stations in society will, no doubt, when the period of discussion arrives, enable them to develop the most enlarged conceptions of so momentous a subject.

I shall, therefore, first, upon the point of union, observe that pressed as the Agricultural body is by opposing interests on the one hand, and in many instances, by an honest misunderstanding, I may say, of the real merits of the question, on the other, it is rather to be regretted that a perfect union of *principle* has not yet taken place among them—one party wishing to hold to the present law as the *basis* of protection, whilst another is advocating an open trade with a graduated scale of duties; and this difference of views is still more to be regretted, as the differing

parties, from their talents and respectability, are capable, by union, of rendering essential service to a cause, in which all are vitally interested, and one requiring the united strength of the Agricultural body, proprietary and tenantry, properly to sustain; and probably the best advice that can be deferentially submitted on such an occasion is “Let there be no strife among the herdsmen, for ye are brethren.”

The plan of a graduated scale of duties, upon a regular importation of foreign grain, appears to me rather to refer to a question of detail than being of itself a first principle; taking for granted (what I think after seven years' experience must be taken for granted) that this country, on an average of years, grows a sufficient quantity of corn, bread corn at least, for its consumption—consequently, any given quantity of foreign grain imported here, I do not mean *occasionally* under the present law, but *regularly* by open ports, *without a proportionate increase in our Export trade*, would have the effect of driving out of the British market just so much British produce as foreign is imported, whether imported under a *high* duty or a *low* one.

If the friends to the principle of a graduated scale of duties are disposed to admit that this country cannot, on an average of years, supply itself with corn sufficient for its consumption, I am equally ready to admit the propriety of discussing the question of a graduated scale of duties; but in no other instance would I do it: and I hope never to see the day, when, from a deficiency of our own growth, this country is rendered permanently dependent upon the foreigner for a single quarter of grain, (or for any other article of necessity she can supply herself with at home) as a prevention to which dependence I view the present conditional prohibitory corn law as the best barrier.

I am aware that the late Ajax of the Agricultural Cause, Mr. Webb Hall, was much opposed to this law; and in speaking of him, I should be sorry to merit the application of the proverb "that the ass may kick the dead lion." But I will take leave to say, that although differing in opinion on many points from this gentleman, of respected memory, I am most ready to admit the strong powers of mind he ever brought into action when advocating

the great cause he espoused; and had he lived to witness the *steady* good effects that have resulted for the last three years from the present corn bill, I think it probable he would have entertained a more favorable opinion of its merits to what he did at the period he was so inimical to it; for such was the accumulation of agricultural distress in the years 1821 and 1822, that I am convinced neither the powers of Mr. Hall's mind, nor those of any individual, however great, could intuitively grasp all the causes of so disastrous a state of things as then existed—therefore opinions formed at such a time would have given place, (at least I surmise so) to others of a different nature, when the mind could more calmly have given itself over to the solution of the important proposition of good corn laws.

I know it will be said, and it may with reason be said, that the present law is productive of fraud—that it exposes the Agriculturist to occasional inundations of foreign grain.—These, however, I consider, *minor* and *temporary* evils, in comparison with those *greater* and *permanent* ones, that would arise from letting the foreigner regularly into the British corn market; for

should foreign corn be regularly allowed to enter there, whether, as before stated, at a high duty or a low one, I think it probable we should soon have an exemplification of Æsop's fable of the Porcupine and the Snakes.—Indeed, the foreign Porcupines only await an opportunity permanently to get into the British nest, *whether by a smaller or a larger aperture is indifferent to them*, when they would shoot out their quills in a way that would render an evacuation of the nest by a considerable portion of the old occupants, very soon necessary.

It is a supposition neither founded upon reason nor upon analogy, that a law can be framed which will wholly exempt the Agriculturist from risks. All persons in business run risks—the merchant—the manufacturer—the ship-owner—the tradesman; and so must the agriculturist, whether from the course of the seasons—whether from the defectiveness of laws, made primarily on his behalf, but intended also to be nationally beneficial.

I am persuaded that, notwithstanding popular prejudices, *unity and continuity* of action, combined with moderate pretensions

on the part of the Agricultural interest, will be the means of insuring in the shape of protection, so far as legislation can avail, all that is essential to the prosperity of the Kingdom in general, and to that of the Agricultural interest in particular.

Next in importance to, and intimately connected with the corn question, is the state of the exportation of woollens from, and the importation of wool into Great Britain.—Upon this subject I brought forward various documents, so long since as March, 1821, (five years,) but from that period to the present one, but few persons could, from their intricacy, accompany me through a variety of foreign details.—A grower of English fine wool, will, however, at this time, *when the facts are brought to his knowledge*, immediately feel that he is affected, and materially affected, when the exportation of woollens from this country has not, from foreign impediments increased, except in a small degree, since the year 1810, but that the importation of foreign wool has increased since 1810, from 7,500,000*lbs.* to nearly 44,000,000*lbs.* and as a Corn grower, he will also immediately see that if such has been the effect of a free

trade in wool, what may be expected from a free trade in corn.

The inference to be drawn from the fact of such an enormous increase as has, for the last four years taken place in the importation of foreign wool, which importation as compared with the exportation of woollens, will be seen in the third Letter—is, either that the wool has been wrought up for home consumption, or that it lays a weight upon the British wool market.—The latter I believe to be, in a very considerable degree, the case; for large and gratifying as has, for some time past, been the increase in the home consumption of woollens, I doubt if it has been sufficiently great to answer *both to the increase in the growth of British wool, and in the importation of foreign wool.*—And it is worthy of observation, that if 7,500,000*lbs.* of foreign wool imported in 1810, answered to an exportation in woollens of about £6,000,000, sterling, when will the last four years' importation be carried off—the average of which having been about 25,000,000*lbs.* per annum, seeing that no increase in the exportation of woollens is likely to take place from this country?—

It is equally worthy of observation, that although the Act of Parliament prohibiting the exportation of British wool has been repealed, and the wool tax in this country removed, hitherto the exportation of British wool has, from heavy duties immediately fixed upon its importation abroad, been so small as scarcely to render it an object of consideration in the present instance.

In all the arguments I have advanced in favour of the present Corn law, as well as those regarding the Wool question, it will, I hope, be found that I have never lost sight of, as such cannot be insensible to, the great value of our foreign commerce—nor to the great principle of a well regulated commercial intercourse, that it is from the foreigner that the increase *externally*, of the wealth of a nation must arise. With respect to commerce, the great man I shall be found so often to have quoted from (whose Essays are a perfect vade-mecum of practical philosophy) has truly said “For their merchants they are vena porta, and if they flourish not, though a nation may have good limbs, yet shall she have empty veins, and nourish little.—Taxes and imposts

upon them value little, for what is thus gained in the hundred is lost in the shire, &c."

But viewing our foreign commerce in comparison with the home trade, I think it is sound wisdom to consider that interest paramount, which is not only the best customer for manufactures, but which also supplies the necessaries of life—particularly on the ground of its preservation being necessary to the maintenance of the independence of any state.

Leaving the example of Carthage—the emporium of commerce in ancient times—and placing Spain as the first memento in modern times, of a nation neglecting her agriculture for visionary pursuits of gain, let the present situation of other states, formerly independent, but nearly if not wholly commercial, be brought to view—Venice under the yoke of Austria—Genoa under the power of the King of Sardinia—Holland under the dominion of the King of the Netherlands—and where may it reasonably be asked will Great Britain be, the first now among nations, should she not take a warning from the fate of states which never raised their political structures upon

the solid foundation of Agricultural industry?—but I leave a hiatus—that I trust will never be filled up—and rather apostrophise with the poet:—

“How blue th’ ethereal vault,
How verdurous the lawns, how clear the brooks!
Such noble warlike steeds, such herds of kine,
So sleek, so vast; such spacious flocks of sheep,
Like flakes of gold illumining the green,
What other paradise adorn but thine,
BRITANNIA! happy, if thy sons would know
Their happiness. To these thy naval streams,
Thy frequent towns superb of busy trade,
And ports magnific add, and stately ships
Innumerable.”—

I may, probably, be charged with having, in my former letter upon the corn laws, * gone too far in congratulations upon the then prosperous state of the country.—What I wrote, I wrote honestly—for although the fatal spirit of gambling had then deeply embued the minds of a large portion of the commercial world, I certainly did not consider it had to the extent it has since proved to have done—nor that its consequences would have been so disastrous to the other portions of the community as fatal experience has evinced—But I yet consider the pillars of the state sound

* To Mr. Canning.

in the main—and if our Agriculture is left to work its way under the present moderate Corn Laws I have no doubt that Great Britain will still retain her political and commercial rank.* I shall beg leave to close these remarks with what I have advanced on a former occasion.† “That with our increasing population, so far from its appearing to be sound policy to throw any of the British soil out of cultivation, it will no doubt be considered the safest step, consequently the wisest one, to continue the fostering care of the government to our Agriculture, “*the primary object of industry in every prosperous state,*” that more land may be brought under the hand of the cultivator, in order to meet the growing demands which in the present, (I may, I hope, still say,) improving state of the country, must be inevitably made for all the necessaries of life.”

1st May, 1826.

* Note Second Edition.—Joined to a reduction of national and parochial expenditure, without which all other efforts will prove unavailing.

† Letter to Mr. Canning.

LETTER I.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MAIDSTONE GAZETTE.

SIR,

AMIDST the numerous theories advanced, and confident assertions made in reference to the projected alteration of the British Corn Laws, many impartial persons whose desire is, if possible, solidly to fix their opinions upon so important a subject, are as much embarrassed as the seaman is to navigate his bark amidst the cross currents and baffling winds of a dangerous and intricate passage.

The difficulties respecting the Corn Laws are in themselves confessedly great, particularly as regard the *probable* or *possible* results that may take place from the proposed alteration. It must, however, be admitted that most, if not all, of the collisions of popular opinion, referring to the present Corn Bill, have their rise either in

some particular interest of individuals, or of partial communities. For example—the petition of Kidderminster for an alteration of the Corn Laws, presented in the last Session of Parliament, stated “That the present restriction upon the importation of corn *had proved*, after an experience of ten years, injurious to the interests of the community.” Thus the inhabitants of Kidderminster—when those of Carlisle stated in their petition “*That it is in the end that the law will prove highly injurious.*” A grave and learned Counsel, in a speech addressed in the autumn of last year to the electors of Stafford, a *manufacturing town*, held forth the Agriculturists as “a body of men having laws made on their behalf unknown in any civilized country—as men opposed to that career of wealth and improvement which this country appeared destined to enter upon, &c. &c.” On the contrary—another grave and learned Counsel, in his address to the electors of Shoreham and the Rape of Bramber, an *agricultural district*, stated that in the event of his being elected their Representative in Parliament, their interest should have all the support which its

growing importance demanded; meaning, no doubt, that he should uphold those very laws so severely denounced by his Learned Brother.—It was well observed, by the Editor of the Farmer’s Journal, on the 11th of April last: “Whilst some avow “their object to be to lower the price of “provisions, and seek to obtain it by a re- “vision of the Corn Laws, others admit “that they do not expect that corn will be “permanently cheaper by having open “ports at all times; but that the preserva- “tion of our foreign trade demands such a “measure.* These are discrepancies which

* *Vide* the speeches made by Mr. Tooke and Mr. Solly, at the City of London Meeting, held on the 13th April, 1825.—The admission of these Gentlemen on the score of prices appears to be fatal to the arguments of the free trade party—for unless corn could be rendered permanently cheaper by the new measure, if carried, which they asserted would not be the case, none of the *anticipated* benefits could arise, on this head, to the manufacturing and commercial interests. If a material increase in the exportation of British Manufactures is also expected from it, there will, it is considered, be no difficulty in proving that such increase will not take place, as the exportation of British commodities is very trifling to the countries from whence foreign corn is imported; nor would it except in a trifling degree, from the poverty of such countries, be much increased by an alteration of the Corn Laws.—W. K. B.

“ cannot be accounted for but on grounds
 “ of ignorance of the subject: and it is
 “ curious to observe that the more respect-
 “ able portion of the advocates for a free
 “ trade in corn do not assert that the price
 “ here is too high, but that it is expedient
 “ that an alteration should be made.”

Leaving however the thousand and one opinions entertained upon the subject of the Corn Laws (in most instances probably of as much validity in the argument as the thousand and one Arabian Tales,) I believe that by ninety and nine persons out of a hundred, it is hoped and considered that an alteration of the law would produce what is termed the cheap loaf.—Now, without entering into a comparison of the terms of cheap or dear—terms that can only be viewed as comparative—or positively discussing the question whether the cheap loaf when obtained, I mean at the expense of the Agriculturist, would, under existing circumstances, be nationally beneficial or not—I think a calm reference to the average price of wheat from February 1823, when the first permanent favourable re-action took place, since the peace in 1814, in the Agricultural interest, (*and with*

it that of all the other great interests of the State—as a cause or an effect of the former it is not necessary here to discuss, as I am merely stating a fact,) will go further towards placing the question of the price of corn upon a clearer basis, than, so far as I am aware of, has hitherto been done—particularly when the relative amount of taxation and general expenses of cultivation between former periods (when Wheat, I admit, might be quoted lower, but not proportionably so to the difference of expenses,)* and the present period is considered. Indeed reflecting upon the immense extent of our population—fed as it is from so limited a surface of soil, and subjected as such soil is both to direct and indirect heavy burthens, it must be matter of astonishment that high prices and great fluctuations have not taken place in the price of wheat, in place of the reasonableness and

* The lowness of price here meant is not one produced by foreign causes, and as inimical to the interest of the consumer as of the grower, as was the case within the last four years, but a price—which answers for a good cultivation of the soil, and is at the same time not injurious to the consumer.

steadiness of price that have been the case for some time past. The latter I think can only be attributed to the steady employment of great capital, skill, and industry, upon the British soil; (not generally a very genial one) all of which, if not destroyed, must, *to the vital injury of the nation at large*, be greatly deteriorated by the proposed measure of a free trade in corn—for *ultimately* should such a measure be carried, corn, from a necessary large demand upon the foreign Agriculturist, consequent upon a declension of British Agriculture, would, it can scarcely be doubted, be elevated to a price abroad—*even if we could get it at all, a problem only, not a fact*—that would render it much higher than it could be regularly grown for here—as, although it would not be desirable to have so dangerous an alteration tested, (therefore the opinion can only be viewed as hypothetical,) I have no doubt, that on an average of seven years, corn would under the existing law, be produced cheaper in England, than by the proposed alteration of the law. As to the question of cheapness, many of the advocates of the new measure, have admitted, as before stated, that,

according to their views, cheapness would not result from its adoption. What the other prospective advantages are to be, I must leave them to ascertain, for I know of none that will in any degree be commensurate with the disadvantages—dangers and imminent ones I ought more properly to say, of rendering an isolated country like this, dependent upon a foreign supply of the very first article of necessity.

But, Sir, I will submit a table of the prices of wheat for the last year, as it appeared in the Maidstone Gazette, of the 24th of January, in confirmation of what I have said upon the question of steadiness of price of this article—when probably some of your readers, more interested in the subject than I am, may be disposed further to investigate this and other of its branches:—

“Average price of wheat sold in Maidstone Market for each month, calculated from the Corn Inspector's Returns.”—

1825.	£.	s.	d.	1825.	£.	s.	d.
January, per qr.	3	10	6	July, per quarter	3	6	10
February	3	7	9	August	3	5	6
March	3	10	1	September	3	3	9
April	3	9	6	October	3	3	5
May	3	9	7	November	3	3	1
June	3	9	0	December	3	1	0

It results from this table, that the average

price of wheat in Maidstone, for the year 1825, was £3. 6s. 8d. per quarter—that the greatest fluctuation was 9s. 6d. per quarter—say in January, price 70s. 6d. per quarter, in December, 61s.—and for ten months out of the twelve, the fluctuation was only 7s. per quarter: viz. in March the price was 70s. 1d. per quarter, and in November, 63s. 1d.*

* The average price of wheat for the whole Kingdom in the year 1825, was 66s. 6d., and the average price of wheat for six years, ending the 5th January 1826, was 57s. 3d., as appears by the following statements.—

CORN TRADE.—Times, 3d March, 1826.

An Account of the Average price of all sorts of Grain in each Quarter, from the 5th of January, 1823, to the 5th of January, 1826.

Quarters ended.	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.
1823.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Feb. 15.	40 7	28 3	17 9	22 10	25 7	30 7
May 15.	52 9	32 8	23 3	29 7	30 4	34 2
Aug. 15.	59 8	32 9	24 6	36 8	33 5	36 1
Nov. 15.	48 8	26 9	20 8	29 3	34 1	32 5
1824.						
Feb. 15.	61 11	33 6	23 7	42 3	38 11	38 4
May 15.	64 7	35 3	24 4	43 5	38 2	36 8
Aug. 15.	59 6	33 11	27 2	40 3	37 4	38 6
Nov. 15.	60 10	38 5	20 10	34 4	41 6	41 1
1825.						
Feb. 15.	66 4	38 3	23 2	30 11	39 11	44 1
May 15.	67 11	37 0	23 11	38 1	36 10	37 7
Aug. 15.	67 9	38 9	25 3	41 9	41 10	41 6
Nov. 15.	64 0	41 4	26 3	41 11	46 3	54 10

Office for Corn Returns,
Feb. 15th, 1826.

WM. JACOB,
Receiver of Corn Returns.

Courier, 17th March, 1826.

CORN AVERAGES.—It appears, from a return presented to Parliament, that the Average Price of Wheat

But, surely, every reflecting person must be convinced, that much more important considerations than the one of a few shillings per quarter more or less in the price of corn, are depending upon the momentous question of an alteration of the Corn Laws—considerations which must come home to every man's business and bosom, if properly entertained. I speak of national ones, regarding the prosperity and independence of the State, resting as they must do upon the progressively improving state of the Agricultural Interest. What a spectacle does Spain now exhibit in consequence of her neglecting, for the imaginary pursuits of gain in the Western world, her solid interests at home! Indeed it ought, if I may, without impiety, be allowed to use the expression, to be engraved on our very door posts—that *the Nation, that neglects her Agriculture, or even that does not make it the primary object of her attention, ultimately loses her independence.*

for the six years, during which the British ports have been closed against foreign corn, is as follows:—1820, 65s. 10d. per quarter; 1821, 54s. 5d.; 1822, 43s. 3d.; 1823, 51s. 9d.; 1824, 62s.; 1825, 66s. 6d.—Giving for the aggregate average of the six years, 57s. 3d.

And I shall in reference to the present situation of Spain, conclude this already, probably, too long a letter, with quoting the following paragraph from a most able letter, which appeared in the Farmer's Journal of the 11th April last, under the signature of *Beds*, a signature, I believe, not unknown to some of your readers:—

“ Spain, one of the most exalted nations
 “ of the earth, up to and during the time
 “ of Charles Vth. and the first Philips,
 “ is no sooner glutted with the treasures
 “ of the Western world than they prey,
 “ like a gnawing worm upon her vitals. If
 “ some of the ruder virtues yet linger in
 “ Asturia, Navarre, Catalonia and provin-
 “ ces less under the influence of extraneous
 “ connexions—the plains of Estramadura,
 “ even of the Castiles, are deserted; the
 “ alluvial soils and maturing sun of the
 “ vallies of Grenada and Valencia in vain
 “ invite the hand of the cultivator—let
 “ Spain, an instance closely in point, be a
 “ warning not lost upon England. In North
 “ America, where the pursuits of the inha-
 “ bitants, some maritime towns excepted,
 “ are purely agricultural—population is
 “ said to double itself in fourteen years;

“ and proceeding in the same ratio would
 “ in half a century be seven-fold—yet far
 “ from such increase becoming an onerous
 “ superfluity, there is a simultaneous pro-
 “ gression in civilization and in the enjoy-
 “ ment of the comforts and elegancies of
 “ life: while the maturing climates, the
 “ exuberant soils, the every way superior
 “ capacities of Southern America have, till
 “ of late, only afforded a bare subsistence
 “ to a scanty sprinkling of either luxurious
 “ Europeans, or miserable inmates of sub-
 “ terranean regions, or imbecile wanderers
 “ among forests and plains. Our favored
 “ country has obtained an imposing alti-
 “ tude—I hope not its meridian. But of
 “ all impulses to its elevation none is so
 “ unalienable, none so justly admired—yet
 “ unenvied, as its unparalleled agriculture.
 “ Unaccountable it is, that this surest and
 “ unoffending support of its pre-eminence
 “ should still be the constant butt of the
 “ implacable enmity of a party among our-
 “ selves, whom it has fed and nourished!
 “ Still more unaccountable it is, that those
 “ more immediately interested in it, who
 “ possess the power to uphold it, upon
 “ whom the duty so to do is peculiarly

“ incumbent, with numbers, unanswerable
“ argument, a just and patriotic cause on
“ their side, should, with apathetic indif-
“ ference, with scarcely an effort for self-
“ preservation, or for the interest of those,
“ by whose toils they maintain the exalted
“ station they have hitherto held, tamely
“ witness the consummation of the catas-
“ trophe.”

I remain your obedient servant,
W. K. B.

January 30, 1826.

LETTER II.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MAIDSTONE GAZETTE.



SIR,

IN continuation of the subject I ad-
dressed you upon on the 30th of January
last, viz. the probable effects of an altera-
tion of the British Corn Laws, particularly
regarding the price of Wheat, I beg leave
to submit to the consideration of your
readers some remarks upon the point of a
reciprocity of trade, as a consequent of
such an alteration, preliminary to which I
give you an extract from a pamphlet upon
Political Economy, from the pen of a Mr.
Roper, as it appeared in the *New Times* of
the 10th of November, 1825:—

“ Nature has given us our portion of
“ physical advantages, but not content
“ with these, we insatiably endeavour to
“ grasp at those also which she has more

“liberally bestowed on other countries.
 “Our insular situation, while it has limited
 “our territory, has opened to us an easy
 “communication with every quarter of the
 “Globe. Our navigable rivers, mineral
 “productions, vast accumulated machi-
 “nery, and numerous industrious and
 “skilful workmen, enable us to excel in
 “manufactures; and it must obviously be
 “the interest of such a country to exchange
 “its manufactured produce for corn, if by
 “so doing the necessary quantity of good
 “corn can be obtained, at a cheaper rate
 “than by cultivating its own soils. Does
 “Yorkshire lose by devoting its industry
 “and capital to the woollen manufacture?
 “or Lancashire by confining herself to
 “that of cotton? or Essex, Suffolk, and
 “Norfolk, by pursuing agriculture? And
 “are not all these better supplied with
 “whatever portion of those products they
 “may require by exchanging with each
 “other, than by each attempting to carry
 “on the whole? But does not the same
 “principle apply to the wines of France
 “and Portugal? the hemp of Russia, the
 “corn of Poland, and rice, cotton, tobacco,
 “and flour of America? Were it not for

“our restrictive laws, would not every
 “one of these products flow freely to be
 “exchanged for our hardware, woollens,
 “or cottons? and would not such com-
 “merce be reciprocally beneficial? It can
 “never be too often repeated, that the
 “genuine commercial spirit—that which
 “permanently secures the prosperity of
 “nations, is altogether inconsistent with
 “the dark and shallow policy of monopoly.
 “The nations of the earth are like pro-
 “vinces of the same Kingdom—a free and
 “unfettered intercourse is alike productive
 “of general and local advantage.”

Most of the principles contained in these
 interrogatories are so demonstrably true,
 that but to admit their general truth is im-
 possible. From the general admission,
 must, however be excepted the proposi-
 tion regarding the introduction of commo-
 dities indigenious to any two or more
 nations, for my understanding is really, at
 present, too obtuse to comprehend the
 necessity or advantage of one nation, re-
 ceiving from another a commodity, which
 nature has provided both with the means to
 obtain by domestic industry, unless upon
 the principle of reciprocity: *viz.* that, from

particular causes, a nation—for instance Great Britain being necessitated for national security as well as for national prosperity, to carry on a high system of culture upon a limited and generally not a very genial surface of soil, disadvantageously so probably in comparison with other nations, but advantageously, under all circumstances, as regards herself, might be induced to receive the corn of Foreign States, *though her domestic supply were sufficient for her demand*, upon the following principle:—Admitted that under ordinary circumstances, we supply ourselves with the first article of necessity (for such admission from experience must be made) from internal resources, yet it is done at a comparatively heavy expense, and necessarily so from circumstances before stated, great industry and capital being requisite to carry on the British system of cultivation, *which is altogether different, as a system, to that of any other state in the world.*

This capital and industry must be preserved, *as well for national as for individual purposes*, in full vigour; but as an increase in trade will bring an increase of consumption, *to meet this increase of con-*

sumption, and this alone, a foreign instead of a domestic supply of corn, shall be resorted to—(I merely propound the question) upon the simple and equitable principle that British productions and manufactures shall be received generally upon the Continent in return for corn imported into Great Britain.

Having stated the proposition, I will take leave to answer it by the simple facts, that the richer states of the Continent will not, and the poorer states cannot, in any great degree, receive more British productions than they now do; and it is with great official care and difficulty that so many of such productions are introduced upon the Continent as is the case at present: therefore foreign corn imported would, in most instances, be paid for in specie and not in goods. Independently of which consideration, it is both physically and morally impossible to produce the happy state of things requisite to bring into action the beautiful theory laid down by Mr. Roper and other writers in favour of free trade. Mr. Maitland, in his excellent pamphlet upon the wool question,

1817, p. 32, says, and truly says: "Per-
 "fect freedom of commerce may, indeed,
 "interest us as a speculation, and when
 "the principle of universal benevolence
 "shall be known and practised by all ranks
 "of men, it may perhaps be found expe-
 "dient to remove the political barriers by
 "which that freedom is restrained: but
 "until that period shall arrive, it must
 "not be forgotten that the age of reason
 "was not the æra of political or moral
 "wisdom, nor did it introduce peace or
 "liberty into any nation which bent the
 "knee before its altar: when other states
 "shall deem it expedient to expose to com-
 "mon use the local advantages which they
 "severally enjoy, it may then be essential
 "to consider the propriety of pursuing the
 "same path; *but it is more than question-*
 "*able how far it would be discreet, in this*
 "*country, to set the example."*

So far from its being possible to estab-
 lish a perfect freedom of trade *between*
nations, it has been found hardly practi-
 cable even to harmonize the principle with
 the contending interests of this nation, ab-
 stractedly in itself. I well recollect that

when the Minister proposed two measures
 that he considered would be beneficial—
 the repeal of the wool-tax, and the reduc-
 tion of duties upon raw silk, coupling
 them with a third, the repeal of the Act
 of Parliament preventing the exportation
 of British wool, the manufacturers of the
 city of Norwich were well content with
 the two former, but were much opposed
 to the latter, which they said would be
 very prejudicial to the interests of the
 city—*its manufactures being great work-*
ers of long spinning wool, the exporting
commodity.

As an answer to Mr. Roper's interroga-
 tory, "that were it not for our restrictive
 "laws, would not every one of these
 "foreign products, (*viz.* the hemp of Rus-
 "sia, corn of Poland, &c.) flow freely into
 "this country, to be exchanged for our
 "hardware, woollens, or cottons?" it can
 easily be ascertained that the hemp and
 tallow of Russia now flow pretty freely
 into this country, and so would the corn of
 Poland, *if it were allowed so to do*; but
 whether in exchange for our cottons, wool-
 lens, and hardware, *is rather more than*

doubtful. With Mr. Roper's permission, I will, on this head, submit the testimony of a Gentleman, well versed in continental trade, Mr. Bischoff.—*Vide* his letter to Mr. Maitland, page 69, of the pamphlet before mentioned; and if Mr. R. will get himself diplomatically clothed, and can induce the Continental Sovereigns generally to alter their commercial policy, he will do what no one has yet been able to do; and until such policy is altered, "the effusion," as Sterne says, "of much Christian ink may be spared," for the alteration really appears to be the hinge upon which most, if not, the whole, of the question of free trade turns.

"In like manner regulations are made to prevent the introduction of English goods in many parts of the Continent. In some they are strictly prohibited, and it would appear that the Continental system, commencing in the Berlin and Milan decrees, is still kept in force, *but with more effect than even during the late wars*: for instead of returning to those regulations which were in existence before the war, the different European Govern-

"ments, all of which had been either supported or placed in power by the blood and treasure of Great Britain, took measures to attack her trade.

"Scarcely was the ink dry by which the treaties of Vienna were signed, ere they all, as if actuated by the same motive, resumed their hostile system. Russia, to which country an immense trade used to be carried on in woollens, has prohibited the importation of all coarse cloth, by enormous duties, except what is ordered by the Government itself for their own troops.

"The King of Sardinia having his Italian dominions restored to him by British valour, and Genoa with its territories added to his kingdom, has not only deprived this country of some of the great privileges she formerly enjoyed in her commercial intercourse with Genoa, but has laid almost prohibitory duties upon the introduction of English goods.

"The Emperor of Germany has prohibited the introduction of all woollen and cotton manufactures into his Italian States. Other countries have adopted a similar policy.

In all discussions upon free trade some party, as before hinted, whose interest would be affected by the measure, if carried, springs up in opposition to it. As the celebrated Saurin stated, in another sense, when preaching upon the obligation of practising universal virtue, "one wants a " saving clause in favour of avarice, another " in favour of ambition, and a third says " give me but my Herodias, or my Drussilla, and you may exclaim as much as " you please against all other vices."

Upon the whole, as the Easterns express Governors, in their several degrees, under the similitude of the Sun, the Moon, and Stars, and as these orbs cannot, *at the same moment*, dispense an equal portion of light and heat to all quarters of the globe, neither can Ministers in legislating for a contrariety of interests, in an Empire like Great Britain, adopt a policy which will harmonize with every particular interest, though it may with the welfare of the nation at large.

I am your very obedient Servant,

W. K. B.

February 16, 1826.

P. S.—I repeat, that what Mr. Roper says of the reciprocal advantages arising from the exchange of the manufactures of Yorkshire and Lancashire, for the corn of Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, is demonstrably true. But should the foreigner, by a free trade, thrust the agriculturists of those counties out of the British market, how can Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex purchase the manufactures of Yorkshire and Lancashire? At this moment I will venture to assert that the county of Norfolk alone is a greater purchaser of such manufactures than the whole of Russia and Poland put together. Freedom of commerce after all is the free exchange of dissimilar, not similar productions. It is most reasonable and advantageous that the wines of France and Portugal; the silk of Italy; the cottons of America; and the coffee and sugar of the West-Indies and the Brazils, should be freely exchanged for British productions. The confusion existing upon the question of free trade appears to rise from not properly fixing the point where the freedom of trade ought to end, and the restrictive system to begin; for, to establish

a free trade between nations *in similar productions*, independent of the principle of universal benevolence, a perfect similarity in morals, politics, and physics, must first be produced.

LETTER III.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MAIDSTONE GAZETTE.



SIR,

IN conclusion of my two former communications, collectively upon Free Trade and the Corn Laws, I beg leave to present you with some maxims of trade laid down in the year 1713, as they will be found in No. 170, of the *Guardian*—the whole of which number may not, at this crisis, be unworthy the attention of your readers.

Notwithstanding the excellence of these propositions—an adherence to which, for so many years, was no doubt a great mean towards elevating this country to her present rank—Agricultural, Manufacturing, and Commercial, circumstances have so far altered, as probably, to render, in some instances, a departure from what was good policy in 1713—eligible in 1826.

For instance—in reference to the third proposition of good trading, *the importation of foreign wool duty free*—I observe, that in the year 1713, the importation of foreign wool into this country amounted only to about 850,000*lbs.* Avoirdupois; as such, good policy dictated, *from the then increasing state of our exports in woollens*, that an encouragement, rather than a discouragement should be given to the importation of foreign wool; but in the years 1822, 1823, and 1824, the average importation of wool was 20,336,238*lbs.* per annum; and in the past year, the importation was 43,700,558*lbs.* therefore the following comparative statement of the importation of wool into, and the exportation of woollens from Great Britain, may, from the state of the figures, suggest the propriety of restraining, *contrary to the policy of 1713*, such an excess of importation, as but a comparatively small permanent increase in the exportation of woollens has taken place since the year 1810, to counterbalance the increase in the importation of foreign wool—the *ratio of such exportation with importation forming the basis of the policy of 1713*, viz. *allowing the importation of foreign wool duty free*—

Exportation of Woollens from Great Britain.		Importation of Wool into Great Britain.	
Average of Years.	£. s. d.	lbs. Avoirdupois.	
from 1700 to 1720.....		869,727	
1765 to 1767—	4,630,384 0 0.....		
1781 to 1789.....		2,660,828	
1800 to 1810—	6,003,688 0 0.....	7,470,584	
Year ——— 1814—	5,623,001 0 0.....	15,712,517	
1821—	6,029,973 0 0.....	16,63,2028	
1822—	6,433,908 0 0.....	19,072,364	
1823—	6,140,257 0 0.....	19,378,129	
1824—	6,926,117 0 0.....	22,558,222	
1825—	Not yet officially published.....	43,700,558	

In making the slightest observation upon the third proposition of *bad trading*, I am aware that, during the present discussions, I am upon tender ground—I can, however, without entering into the merits of these discussions, be allowed to observe, that uncontrollable circumstances, such as the following, may warrant even the introduction of foreign commodities into a country manufacturing the like commodities. Admitted, first, *agreeably to the principle laid down upon this proposition*, that the introduction of foreign commodities common to herself, (that is without the *quid pro quo*,) is most injurious, yet, seeing, as

in the case now mooted, that an entire prohibition of certain articles, *viz.* Silks, Laces, Gloves, &c. gives a fashionable value to them, that probably, they would not otherwise possess; and which articles can be easily conveyed to this country, from a proximate state like that of France—*Query*—whether their regular importation upon the payment of a duty considered, in ordinary circumstances, equivalent to the difference in the expense of manufacturing between the two countries, is not better than their entire prohibition? as, notwithstanding such prohibition is enforced against the contrabandist, both fiscally and criminally, as far as it can be, he is still found to be introducing prohibited articles in incalculable quantities.

Allowing the validity of this argument for removing the present prohibition from French Silks, Gloves, &c. no legitimate application of such validity can be made to the present Corn Laws: for corn has no fashionable value attached to it—nor can it, by reason of its bulk, be smuggled into a country as more portable articles can be. Independently of these considerations

there are *national ones*, which render a free trade in the *very first necessary of life* very different to a free trade in the *superfluities of life*.

The enormous influx of foreign wool into this country, *so out of all ratio with the exportation of woollens*, constitutes also, in my mind a strong argument against a free trade in corn—and the fact of this influx (one I have for nearly five years past more or less argued upon) is as important to the British corn grower *inferentially*, as it is to the wool grower *positively*—pointing out to the former, from the state of the importation of foreign wool by a free trade, what probably would be the result to him of a free trade in corn.

Without multiplying arguments, either upon the general question of free trade, or the particular one of a free trade in corn, I must say it appears to me that all writers upon both questions are considering, what ought to, or might be, under such and such circumstances, and not what can be under existing ones. To establish a perfect freedom of trade between nations, *in the present imperfect state of human nature,*

and human institutions, is impossible-- that freedom must be, coeval alone with the millenium. And in conclusion, upon this point in particular, I repeat the observations of Mr. Maitland, given in my second letter: "Perfect freedom of commerce may, indeed, interest us as a speculation, and when the principle of universal benevolence shall be known and practised by all ranks of men, it may perhaps be found expedient to remove the political barriers by which that freedom is restrained; but until that period shall arrive, it must not be forgotten that the age of reason was not the æra of political or moral wisdom, nor did it introduce peace or liberty into any nation or society which bent the knee before its altar--when other states shall deem it expedient to expose to common use, the local advantages which they severally enjoy, it may then be essential to consider the propriety of pursuing the same path, but it is more than questionable how far it would be discreet in this country at the present moment to set the example."

With my thanks for the means you have afforded me for offering to the public some plain facts and humble inferences, relating to points of the highest moment to the national prosperity,

I remain, Sir,

Your very obedient Servant,

W. K. B.

25th February, 1826.



GENERAL MAXIMS OF TRADE,

PARTICULARLY APPLIED TO THE COMMERCE BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

Guardian, No. 170.—1713.

"1.—That trade which exports manufactures made of the product of the country is undoubtedly good; such is the sending abroad our Yorkshire cloth, Colchester baize, Exeter serges, Norwich stuffs, &c. which being made purely of British wool, as much as those exports amount to, so much is the clear gain of the nation.

“ 2.—That trade which helps off the
 “ consumption of our superfluities, is also
 “ visibly advantageous; as in the exporting
 “ of allum, copperas, leather, tin, lead,
 “ coals, &c. So much as the exported
 “ superfluities amount unto, so much also
 “ is the clear national profit.

“ 3.—The importing of foreign materials
 “ to be manufactured at home, *especially*
 “ *when the goods, after they are manufac-*
 “ *tured, are mostly sent abroad,* is also,
 “ without dispute, very beneficial; as, for
 “ instance, Spanish wool, which for that
 “ reason is exempted from paying any
 “ duties.

“ 4.—The importation of foreign mate-
 “ rials, to be manufactured here, although
 “ the manufactured goods may be chiefly
 “ consumed by us, may be also beneficial;
 “ especially when the said materials are
 “ procured in exchange for our commodi-
 “ ties; as raw silk, grogram yarn, and
 “ other goods brought from Turkey.

“ 5.—Foreign materials wrought up here
 “ into such goods as would otherwise be
 “ imported ready manufactured, is a means
 “ of saving money to the nation: such
 “ is the importation of flax, hemp, and

“ raw silk; *it is therefore to be wondered at,*
 “ *that those commodities are not exempt from*
 “ *all duties, as well as Spanish wool.*

“ 6.—A trade may be called good which
 “ exchanges manufactures for manufac-
 “ tures, and commodities for commodities
 “ —Germany takes as much in value of
 “ our woollens and other goods, as we do
 “ of their linens: by this means, numbers
 “ of people are employed on both sides to
 “ their mutual advantage.

“ 7.—An importation of commodities,
 “ bought partly with money, and partly
 “ with goods, may be of national advan-
 “ tage; if the greatest part of the commo-
 “ dities thus imported, are again exported,
 “ as in the case of East India goods, and
 “ generally all imports of goods *which are*
 “ *re-exported,* are beneficial to a nation.

“ 8.—The carrying of goods from one
 “ foreign country to another, is a profitable
 “ article of trade—our ships are often thus
 “ employed between Portugal, Italy, and
 “ the Levant, and sometimes in the East
 “ Indies.*

* From a combination of circumstances, this valu-
 able branch of trade is now unfortunately almost lost

“ 9.—When there is a necessity to import goods which a nation cannot be

to Great Britain, particularly in the Mediterranean, upon which much might be said. W. K. B.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

Extract from the Right Hon. Wm. Huskisson's speech upon the state of British Shipping—12th of May, 1826.—(COURIER.)

“ Upon the general pacification of Europe, but before we laid up our ships in ordinary, we insisted upon the Powers of Barbary abandoning the illegitimate mode in which they carried on war against the States of the Mediterranean, taking prisoners for the sake of the ransom, or to make them slaves. The abolition of this caused a great change in the commerce of the Mediterranean. I do not mean to say that what we did was not praiseworthy, and although it was not a positive duty to put an end to such a state of things; although there was no great moral obligation for us to do it, as in the case of the slave trade, and be it right or wrong, it is right, as I think, and it will be looked upon as such by history, to the honour of England; but it has produced a change injurious to our shipping in that quarter. Before that event the flag of Great Britain was the only one which was protected from the piracies of the barbarians; but afterwards all the flags of the little states of the Mediterranean, were equally respected with our own. This, of course, had the effect of diminishing the quantity of English ships, and the number of English sailors employed in the Mediterranean. In the coasting

“ without, although such goods are chiefly purchased with money, it cannot be accounted a bad trade, as our trade to Norway and other parts from whence are imported naval stores, and materials for building.”

BUT A TRADE IS DISADVANTAGEOUS TO A NATION.

“ 1.—Which brings in things of mere luxury and pleasure, which are entirely, or for the most part, consumed among us; and such I reckon the wine trade to be, especially when the wine is purchased with money, and not in exchange for our commodities.

“ 2.—Much worse is that trade which brings in a commodity that is not only

“ trade of the Mediterranean, there were 16,000 British seamen employed, and from 7,000 to 8,000 natives. But for this circumstance that trade must have been carried on by British ships alone. I cannot say exactly what change may have taken place on that account, but I recollect that an Honourable Member, now no more, (Mr. Marryatt) stated, that the number of vessels in the Mediterranean had decreased from eight or ten thousand to between seven and eight hundred.”—*Vide Appendix to the author's Letter to Mr. Canning, No. 2, page 59.*

“ consumed among us, *but hinders the consumption of the like quantity of ours—*
“ As is the importation of brandy, which
“ hinders the spending of our extracts of
“ malt* and molasses ; therefore very prudently charged with excessive duties.

“ 3.—That trade is eminently bad which
“ supplies the same goods as we manufacture ourselves, especially if we can make
“ enough for our consumption ; and I take
“ this to be the case of the silk manufacture ; which with great labour and industry, is brought to perfection in London, Canterbury, and other places.

* The subject of the present high duty upon Malt—the standard article for forming the poor man’s beverage—has, in more than one instance, been recently brought before the British Legislature, and in a temperate way that in almost every instance *finally* ensures success in these cases.

The proposition that “ the voice of the people is the voice of God,” must be subjected to a limitation, as a distinction must be made between popular clamour and the correct expressions of public feeling : but the one “ of the public weal being the supreme law,” may be taken in an unlimited sense ; and I know of nothing that can have a greater tendency to promote the public weal, than every attention being paid to the welfare of the labouring part of the community.—W. K. B.

“ 4.—The importation upon easy terms
“ of such manufactures as are already
“ introduced in a country, must be of bad
“ consequence, and check their progress ;
“ as it would undoubtedly be the case of
“ the linen and paper manufactures of
“ Great Britain, (which are of late very
“ much improved,) if those commodities
“ were suffered to be brought in without
“ paying very high duties.”

APPENDIX.*

(CIRCULAR.)

SIR,

I have the honour to annex you a copy of a letter I addressed to Mr. Canning on the 14th of March last, with some printed details relative to the state of the trades in wool and woollen manufactures, and I have no doubt that upon an examination of the details, you will admit a direct case for enquiry has been made out. I trust they will also tend, in a considerable degree, to elucidate, from analogy, some important points of the Corn Question.

*A part of this Appendix has been presented before to the Public in a separate printed form, but it is now connected with the Corn question, in order to bring the two subjects of corn and wool into conjunction.

With respect to the latter, I am daily more confirmed in the opinion of the political propriety of not allowing foreign corn regularly to enter the British market, particularly for two reasons: First—The preservation of the country from a dependence upon the foreigner for the first article of necessity—and Secondly, that our specie may be retained in the country, as should open ports be at all times allowed for foreign grain, I am persuaded a perpetual drainage of specie would be the consequence; for I know of no idea so delusive as the one of British manufactures being taken in return, I mean in any adequate degree, for foreign corn imported.—Were such to be the case, I admit that this branch of the subject might be mooted on very different grounds.—The Continental commercial system is one that, without presumption, I may assume the capability of giving, whenever required so to do, rather a confident opinion upon, and at present, I see no reason to alter any positions I may have before deduced from it—when I do, I shall willingly make my retractation.

The *Maidstone Gazette*, of the 28th of March last, contained, I believe finally,

what I have to advance upon the necessity of an enquiry into the state of the wool and woollen trades, and it will remain for the English wool growers, *of fine wools in particular*, to take those steps the exigencies of the case may be deemed to require.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

WM. KEER BROWN.

To———

(COPY.)

Maidstone, 14th March, 1826.

SIR,

I have the honour to submit to your consideration some details respecting the importation of Foreign wool into, and the exportation of woollens from Great Britain.

In reference to the diminished state *comparatively*, of the exportation of woollens from this country since the peace in

1814—I beg leave to say, that so long since as the 23d March, 1821, I presented to the late Marquis of Londonderry, some official facts arising out of the Continental commercial system—a system that continues with unabated rigour, as regards the introduction generally of British commodities upon the Continent.

Probably at the period alluded to—either the subject was not considered of sufficient importance to merit an enquiry into, or it was anticipated that such a modification of the system might take place as would cause an increase in the exportation of woollens—thereby rendering enquiry useless.—This unfortunately has not been the case; and the enormous increase in the importation of foreign wool, *so out of all ratio with the exportation of woollens*, has become an object of most serious consideration to the growers of English fine wools.

The effect of an importation of wool into this country is different to one of an importation of silk or cotton, inasmuch as the latter, being articles purely of foreign growth, are soon taken from an over-loaded market upon a revival of commerce.—Not

so with wool, as our own growth of that article increases the weight upon an overloaded market, which will soon pre-eminently be the case—as to the enormous increase in the importation of foreign wool, the British growth of wool of the year 1826, will soon be added.

At this period no doubt, Sir, the subject will be deemed one fit for enquiry into—not only as interesting the British wool grower, *positively*, but the British corn grower, *inferentially*.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

WM. KEER BROWN.

To the Right Hon. George Canning, M. P.
His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State
for Foreign Affairs, &c. &c. &c.

EXTRACT from a preface to three letters in continuation, relative to a FREE TRADE IN CORN, in Great Britain,

addressed to the Editor of the *Maidstone Gazette*, on the 30th of January, 16th and 25th of February, 1826, by

WM. KEER BROWN.

“ Next in importance to and intimately connected with the Corn Question, is the state of the exportation of woollens from and the importation of wool into Great Britain.—Upon this subject I brought forward various documents so long since as March, 1821, (five years) but from that period to the present one, few persons could, from their intricacy, accompany me through a variety of foreign details. A grower of English fine wool will however, *at this time*, when the facts are brought to his knowledge, immediately feel that he is affected, and materially affected, when the exportation of woollens from this Country has not, from foreign impediments, but little increased since the year 1810—but that the importation of foreign wool has increased since 1810, from about 7,500,000lbs. avoirdupois to nearly 44,000,000lbs.—and, as a corn grower, he will also immediately see that if such has been the effect of a

“ free trade in wool,* what may be expected from a free trade in corn.

“ The inference to be drawn from the fact of such an enormous increase as has for the four last years taken place in the importation of foreign wool, which importation as compared with the exportation of woollens will be seen in the third Letter, is either that the wool has been wrought up for home consumption, or that it lays a weight upon the English wool market. The latter I believe to be, in a very considerable degree, the case; for large and gratifying as has for some time past been the increase in the home trade in woollens, I doubt if it has been sufficiently great to answer both to the increase in the growth of British wool and to that in the importation of foreign wool; and it is worthy of observation, that if 7,500,000lbs. of foreign wool imported in 1810, answered to an exportation of woollens of about £6,000,000 sterling,

* Even when the wool tax existed, it was too small to prevent an increase generally in the importation of foreign wool, as compared with that which took place previously to the tax being imposed.

“ when will the last four years' importation be carried off,—the average of which having been not less than 25,000,000lbs. per annum, seeing that no increase in the exportation of woollens from this country is likely to take place.—It is equally worthy of observation, that although the Act of Parliament prohibiting the exportation of British wool has been repealed, and the wool tax in this country removed, hitherto the exportation of British wool has, from heavy duties immediately fixed upon its importation abroad been so small, as scarcely to render it an object of consideration in the present instance.

Average of Years.	£.	s.	d.	lbs. Avoirdupois.
Exportation of Woollens from Great Britain.				Importation of Wool into Great Britain.
from 1700 to 1720.....				869,727
1765 to 1767—	4,630,384	0	0	
1781 to 1789.....				2,660,828
1800 to 1810—	6,003,688	0	0	7,470,584
Year ——— 1814—	5,628,001	0	0	15,712,517
1821—	6,029,973	0	0	16,63,2028
1822—	6,433,908	0	0	19,072,364
1823—	6,140,257	0	0	19,378,129
1824—	6,926,117	0	0	22,558,222
1825—	5,925,574	0	0	43,700,558

THE SHEEP.

(From the Encyclopædia Britannica.)

AMONGST the various animals with which divine Providence has stored the world for the use of man, none is to be found more innocent, more useful, or more valuable than the Sheep. The Sheep supplies us with food and clothing, and finds ample employment for our poor at all times and seasons of the year, whereby a variety of manufactures of woollen cloth is carried on without interruption to domestic comfort, and loss to friendly society or injury to health, as is not the case with many other occupations. Every lock of wool that grows on its back becomes the means of support to staplers, dyers, pickers, scourers, scribblers, carders, combers, spinners, spoolers, warpers, queelers, weavers, fullers, tuckers, burlers, shear-men, pressers, clothiers, and packers, who, one after another, tumble and toss, and twist and bake and boil, this raw material, till they have extracted a livelihood out of it;

and then comes the merchant, who, in his turn, ships it (in its highest state of improvement) to all quarters of the globe, from whence he brings back every kind of riches to his country, in return for this valuable commodity which the sheep affords,

Besides this, the useful animal after being deprived of his coat, produces another, against the next year, and when we are hungry and kill him for food, he gives us his skin to employ the fell-mongers and parchment-makers, who supply us with a durable material for securing our estates, rights and possessions, and if our enemies take the field against us, with a powerful instrument for rousing our courage to repel their attacks. When the parchment-maker has taken as much of the skin as he can use, the glue-maker comes after, and picks up every morsel that is left, and therewith supplies a material for the carpenter and cabinet-maker, which they cannot do without, and which is essentially necessary before we can have elegant furniture in our houses: tables, chairs, looking-glasses, and a hundred other articles of convenience: and when the winter nights come in, while we are deprived of

the cheering light of the sun; the sheep supplies us with an artificial mode of light, whereby we preserve every pleasure of domestic society, and with the assistance of which we can continue our work, or write or read, and improve our mind, or enjoy the social mirth of our tables. Another part of the slaughtered animal supplies us with an ingredient necessary for making good common soap, a useful store for producing cleanliness in every family, rich or poor. Neither need the horns be thrown away, for they are converted by the button-makers and turners into a cheap kind of button, tips for bows, and many useful ornaments. From the very trotters an oil is extracted, useful for many purposes, and they afford good food when baked in an oven.

Even the bones are useful also, for by a late invention of Dr. Higgins, they are found, when reduced to ashes, to be a useful and essential ingredient in the composition of the finest artificial stone, in ornamental work for chimney-pieces, cornices of rooms, houses, &c. which renders the composition more durable by effectually preventing its cracking.

If it is objected to the meek inoffensive creature, that he is expensive while living, in eating up our grass, &c. it may be answered that it is quite the contrary, for he can feed where every other animal has been before him, and grazed all he could find, and that if he take a little grass on our downs, or in our fields, he amply repays us for every blade of grass in the richness of the manure he leaves behind him. He protects the hands from the cold wintry blast, by providing them with the softest leather gloves. Every gentleman is also indebted to him for the neat binding of his books, for the sheath of his sword, and for cases for his instruments; in short, not to be tedious in mentioning the various uses of leather, there is hardly any furniture or utensil of life but the sheep contributes to render either more useful, convenient, or ornamental.

*Extract from the Resolutions, passed at a Meeting of
the Maidstone Agricultural Association, held at
Maidstone, on the 20th of April, 1826.*

JAMES ELLIS, ESQ. IN THE CHAIR.

“Resolved.—That this Meeting views with alarm the increased and increasing importation of foreign wool, particularly the unexampled increase of last year; and considering the vast importance of the wool trade both to the Agricultural and Manufacturing prosperity of the country, this Meeting trusts that some enquiry may take place into the state of the wool and woollen trades, in order—either that an increase in the exportation of Woollens may be effected, or that the importation of foreign wool may be restrained.”

“RESOLVED,—That this Meeting consider that the effect of a free trade in wool is a good criterion practically to judge of what may be expected from a free trade in Corn, should ever such a measure be carried into effect.”

FINIS.

Printed by J. Loder, Woodbridge.